

## REMARKS

Applicants are filing this Response within the shortened statutory period. Consequently, Applicants believe that no fee is due with this filing; however, if a fee is due please charge Deposit Account No. 502295.

Claims 1-20, 26 and 27 were presented for examination. The final Office Action mailed October 17, 2007 rejects claims 1-20, 26 and 27. Applicants herein amend claims 1, 4, 5, 16, 19, 20 and 26. Claims 1-20, 26 and 27 remain pending in the application.

### **Rejection of Claims 1-20, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7, 9, 11-20, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication No. 2003/0172113 A1 to Cameron et al. (hereinafter “Cameron”) in view of US Patent Publication No. 2004/0230598 to Robertson et al. (hereinafter “Robertson”) and US Patent No. 7,092,977 to Leung et al. (hereinafter “Leung”). The Office Action rejects claims 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cameron, Robertson and Leung, and further in view of US Patent Publication No. 2005/0071741 to Acharya et al. (hereinafter “Acharya”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to the extent it is maintained against the pending claims after entry of the amendments made herein because the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest every claimed element and limitation of Applicants’ invention.

Cameron discloses a system and method for converting documents formatted for an office environment to documents formatted for small devices (e.g., personal digital assistants and cell phones), for converting documents formatted for small devices to documents formatted form an office environment, and for synchronizing documents on small devices with office documents on a server. Documents on a client and the server can be merged if the two documents are independently modified (see, for example, paragraphs [0028] and [0029]). Document format differences are managed to achieve compatibility between documents edited and stored on the client and documents edited and stored on the server.

Robertson discloses a document filtering system. New documents, or newly modified documents, are compared to user profiles stored in memory. Terms in a new document along

with their frequency of occurrence (i.e., weighting) are compared with terms and term weights in user profiles to determine whether the documents conform to or match any of the user profiles. If any matches are found, the new document or a message identifying the new document is sent by the document filtering system to the users associated with the matching user profiles. (See, for example, paragraph [0020]). Each profile scoring file is associated with a single new document, or modified document, and is structured to maintain a profile scoring record for multiple user profiles (paragraph [0049]).

Leung is described in the Office Action as teaching a threshold value and a comparison. Leung discloses a threshold that is based on a storage capacity and is used to manage storage resources.

Applicants' invention, as now set forth in representative claim 1, recites "calculating, for a plurality of times and a plurality of clients, a document score for each document in a plurality of documents in the server database." Claim 1 further recites that a document in the sever database is transmitted to the client "based on a comparison of the threshold value and a respective document score for a latest time." Support for the amendment of claim 1 can be found at least at paragraphs [00014] and [00020] of Applicants' specification.

As stated in the Office Action, Cameron does not teach calculation of a document score or the comparison of a threshold value with any kind of document value. Applicants submit that Leung, which is cited in the Office Action for teaching a threshold, also does teach or suggest the calculation of a document score. Although Robertson discloses profile scoring files, profile scoring is only performed once for a document (i.e., a new document or a modified document). Because Robertson's disclosed document filtering process is intended for notifying users of the presence of new documents or modified documents), such documents need to be scored only once. Consequently, there is no need or motivation for Robertson's profile scoring process to include recalculation (periodically or otherwise) of previously received documents. Although profiles may be updated (see, e.g., paragraph 0022 of Robertson), scores associated with previously received documents are not updated. Instead, the updated profiles are applied to documents received after the updating. Thus document scores are not calculated at a plurality of times and there is no comparison of a threshold value and a document score at a latest time as now recited in Applicants' claim 1. As a consequence of these distinctions, Applicants' claimed

invention has an important feature that is not provided by the document filtering system of Robertson (whether or not in combination with the other cited references). Specifically, a document which may not have been of sufficient importance for synchronization at an earlier time can become of greater importance to a client at a later time and therefore can be synchronized at a later time.

For the reasons above, Applicants submit that Cameron, Robertson and Leung, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest every element and limitation of independent claim 1 as now set forth. Thus Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn. Independent claims 16 and 26 recite language similar to that of claim 1, and therefore are allowable for at least the reasons provided with respect to claim 1. Dependent claims 2-7, 9, 11-15, 17-20 and 27 depend directly or indirectly from one of the patentable independent claims, and incorporate all of the limitations of the respective independent claim. Thus these dependent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least those reasons provided in connection with the independent claims and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of these dependent claims.

Dependent claims 8 and 10 were rejected under Cameron, Robertson and Leung, and in further view of Acharya. The Office Action uses the disclosure of Acharya for the purpose of showing the additional limitations recited in these dependent claims. Regardless of whether or not Acharya shows such limitations, Applicants submit that Acharya does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1 described above as missing from the other cited references. Thus Applicants submit that dependent claims 8 and 10 are allowable over the cited references for at least those reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1 and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of these dependent claims.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims that have not been expressed.

In view of the remarks made herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and request early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicants' representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-2003.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 6, 2007  
Reg. No. 41,047

Tel. No.: (508) 303-2003  
Fax No.: (508) 303-0005

/William G. Guerin/  
William G. Guerin  
Attorney for Applicants  
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP  
5 Mount Royal Avenue  
Marlborough, MA 01752